arXiv:1407.6852v2 [math.OA] 14 Oct 2014

RELATIVE POSITION OF THREE SUBSPACES IN A HILBERT SPACE

MASATOSHI ENOMOTO AND YASUO WATATANI

Abstract. We study the relative position of three subspaces in a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. In the finite-dimensional case, Brenner described the general position of three subspaces completely. We extend it to a certain class of three subspaces in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. We also give a partial result which gives a condition on a system to have a (dense) decomposition containing a pentagon.

KEYWORDS: three subspaces, Hilbert space,

AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION: 46C07, 47A15, 15A21, 16G20, 16G60.

1. Introduction

We study the relative position of three subspaces in a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space.

The relative position of one subspace of a Hilbert space is extremely simple and determined by the dimension and the co-dimension of the subspace. It is a well known fact that the relative position of two subspaces E and F in a Hilbert space H can be described completely up to unitary equivalence as in Araki [1],Davis [4], Dixmier [5] and Halmos [15]. The Hilbert space is the direct sum of five subspaces:

$$H = (E \cap F) \oplus (\text{the rest}) \oplus (E \cap F^{\perp}) \oplus (E^{\perp} \cap F) \oplus (E^{\perp} \cap F^{\perp}).$$

In the rest part, E and F are in generic position and the relative position is described only by "the angles" between them.

We disregard "the angles" and study the still-remaining fundamental feature of the relative position of subspaces. This is the reason why we use bounded invertible operators instead of unitaries to define isomorphisms in our paper.

Let H be a Hilbert space and $E_1, \dots E_n$ be n subspaces in H. Then we say that $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is a system of n subspaces in H or an n-subspace system in H. Let $\mathcal{T} = (K; F_1, \dots, F_n)$ be another system of n-subspaces in a Hilbert space K. We say that systems $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are *isomorphic* if there is a bounded invertible operator $\varphi : H \to K$ satisfying that $\varphi(E_i) = F_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. See also Sunder [24] for other topics on n-subspaces.

In [3] S. Brenner gave a complete description of systems of three subspaces up to isomorphims when an ambient space H is finite-dimensional.

A system $\mathcal{S}$ is called indecomposable if $\mathcal{S}$ can not be decomposed into a nontrivial direct sum. If the ambient Hilbert space H is finite-dimensional, then any system of n subspaces in H is a finite direct sum of indecomposable systems.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be an indecomposable system of three subspaces in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is isomorphic to one of the following eight trivial systems $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_8$ and one non-trivial system $\mathcal{S}_9$:

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = (\mathbb{C}; 0, 0, 0), \quad \mathcal{S}_2 = (\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C}, 0, 0), \quad \mathcal{S}_3 = (\mathbb{C}; 0, \mathbb{C}, 0),$$

$$\mathcal{S}_4 = (\mathbb{C}; 0, 0, \mathbb{C}), \quad \mathcal{S}_5 = (\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}, 0), \quad \mathcal{S}_6 = (\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C}, 0, \mathbb{C}),$$

$$\mathcal{S}_7 = (\mathbb{C}; 0, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}), \quad \mathcal{S}_8 = (\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}), \quad \mathcal{S}_9 = (\mathbb{C}^2; \mathbb{C}(1,0), \mathbb{C}(0,1), \mathbb{C}(1,1)).$$

See, for example, [10], [14] or [6] on indecomposable systems of n subspaces.

Therefore we have the following theorem of Brenner:

Theorem 1.1 (Brenner [3])**.** *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is isomorphic to the following $\mathcal{T} = (H; F_1, F_2, F_3)$ such that there exist subspaces $S, N_1, N_2, N_3, M_1, M_2, M_3, Q, L$ of H satisfying that Q has a form*

$$(Q; Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) := (K \oplus K; K \oplus 0, 0 \oplus K, \{(x, x) \mid x \in K\})$$

of double triangle and

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= S \oplus N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus N_3 \oplus M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3 \oplus Q \oplus L \\
F_1 &= S \oplus 0 \quad \oplus N_2 \oplus N_3 \oplus M_1 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus 0 \quad \oplus Q_1 \oplus 0 \\
F_2 &= S \oplus N_1 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus N_3 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus M_2 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus Q_2 \oplus 0 \\
F_3 &= S \oplus N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus 0 \quad \oplus 0 \quad \oplus M_3 \oplus Q_3 \oplus 0
\end{aligned}$$

Remark. In the above decomposition, we can choose $\mathcal{T}$ such that $S = F_1 \cap F_2 \cap F_3$, $N_1 = F_1^\perp \cap F_2 \cap F_3$, $N_2 = F_1 \cap F_2^\perp \cap F_3$, $N_3 = F_1 \cap F_2 \cap F_3^\perp$, $M_1 = F_1 \cap F_2^\perp \cap F_3^\perp$ $M_2 = F_1^\perp \cap F_2 \cap F_3^\perp$, $M_3 = F_1^\perp \cap F_2^\perp \cap F_3$ and $L = F_1^\perp \cap F_2^\perp \cap F_3^\perp$. But we should be careful that the isomorphism by an invertible operator does not preserve the orthogonality.

The aim of our paper is to extend the Brenner's theorem to a certain class of three subspaces in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space.

The above Brenner's theorem says that any system of three subspaces of a finite-dimensional Hilbert space is decomposed as a direct sum of a distributive part (or Boolean part)

$$S \oplus N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus N_3 \oplus M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3 \oplus L$$

and a non-distributive part Q. Furthermore the non-distributive part $Q = K \oplus K$ has a typical form

$$(K \oplus K; K \oplus 0, 0 \oplus K, \{(x, x) \ | x \in K\})$$

of double triangle. The double triangle is the *only* obstruction of distributive law in finite-dimensional case. We study this type of decomposition for a certain class of systems of three subspaces for an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. In order to proceed this type of decomposition, we should recall the following basic facts on the subspace lattice structure: In general, a lattice is distributive if and only if it has neither a double triangle nor a pentagon as a sublattice, see [11] for example. In the subspace lattices of an infinite dimensional Hilbert space, there occur both double triangles and pentagons. A von Neumann algebra M is commutative if and only if the lattice of the projections in M is distributive. A von Neumann algebra M is finite if and only if the lattice of the projections in M has no pentagons if and only if the lattice of the projections in M is modular. Therefore we understand that the general case is far beyond having a Brenner type decomposition.

For any bounded linear operator A on a Hilbert space K, we can associate a system $\mathcal{S}_A$ of four subspaces in $H = K \oplus K$ by

$$\mathcal{S}_A = (H; K \oplus 0, 0 \oplus K, \text{graph}\, A, \{(x, x); x \in K\}).$$

Two such systems $\mathcal{S}_A$ and $\mathcal{S}_B$ are isomorphic if and only if the two operators A and B are similar. The direct sum of such systems corresponds to the direct sum of the operators. In this sense the theory of operators is included into the theory of relative positions of four subspaces. In particular on a finite dimensional space, Jordan blocks correspond to indecomposable systems. Moreover on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space, the above system $\mathcal{S}_A$ is indecomposable if and only if A is strongly irreducible, which is an infinite-dimensional analog of a Jordan block, see, for example, a monograph by Jiang and Wang [19].

Halmos initiated the study of transitive lattices and gave an example of transitive lattice consisting of seven subspaces in [16]. Harrison-Radjavi-Rosenthal [17] constructed a transitive lattice consisting of six subspaces using the graph of an unbounded closed operator. Hadwin-Longstaff-Rosenthal found a transitive lattice of five non-closed linear subspaces in [14]. Any finite transitive lattice which consists of n subspaces of a Hilbert space H gives an indecomposable system of $n-2$ subspaces by withdrawing 0 and H, but the converse is not true. It is still unknown whether or not there exists a transitive lattice consisting of five subspaces. Therefore it is also an interesting problem to know whether there exists an indecomposable system of three subspaces in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space.

Throughout the paper a projection means an operator e with $e^2 = e = e^*$ and an idempotent means an operator p with $p^2 = p$. The

direct sum $\oplus$ is the orthogonal direct sum and $\oplus_{alg}$ is the algebraic direct sum. The subspace mostly means closed subspace except the algebraic direct sum.

There seems to be interesting relations with the study of representations of $*$-algebras generated by idempotents by S. Kruglyak and Y. Samoilenko [22] and the study on sums of projections by S. Kruglyak, V. Rabanovich and Y. Samoilenko [21]. But we do not know the exact implication, because their objects are different with ours.

In finite dimensional case, the classification of four subspaces is described as the classification of the representations of the extended Dynkin diagram $D_4^{(1)}$. Recall that Gabriel [9] listed Dynkin diagrams A_n, D_n, E_6, E_7, E_8 in his theory on finiteness of indecomposable representations of quivers. We discussed on indecomposable representations of quivers on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces [7]. We are also under the influence of subfactor theory by Jones [20].

Our study also has a relation with C^*-algebras generated by idempotents or projections. See Bottcher, Gohberg, Karlovich, Krupnik, Roch , Silbermann and Spittovsky [2] , Hu and Xue [18] and references there.

After we completed our paper, we noticed that there might be a connection with Kadison-Singer algebras introduced by Ge and Yuan [12] and [13].

The authors are supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant number 23654053 and 25287019.

2. systems of n subspaces

We introduce some basic definitions and facts on the relative position of n subspaces in a separable Hilbert space. Let H be a Hilbert space and $E_1, \dots E_n$ be n subspaces in H. Then we say that $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \dots, E_n)$ is a system of n-subspaces in H or an n-subspace system in H. Let $\mathcal{T} = (K; F_1, \dots, F_n)$ be another system of n-subspaces in a Hilbert space K. Then $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$ is called a homomorphism if $\varphi : H \to K$ is a bounded linear operator satisfying that $\varphi(E_i) \subset F_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. And $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$ is called an isomorphism if $\varphi : H \to K$ is an invertible (i.e., bounded bijective) linear operator satisfying that $\varphi(E_i) = F_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We say that systems $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are *isomorphic* if there is an isomorphism $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$. This means that the relative positions of n subspaces $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ in H and $(F_1, \dots, F_n)$ in K are same under disregarding angles. We say that systems $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are *unitarily equivalent* if the above isomorphism $\varphi : H \to K$ can be chosen to be a unitary. This means that the relative positions of n subspaces $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ in H and $(F_1, \dots, F_n)$ in K are same with preserving the angles between the subspaces. We are interested in the relative position of subspaces up to isomorphism to study the still-remaining fundamental feature of the relative position after disregarding "the angles" .

We denote by $Hom(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ the set of homomorphisms of $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{T}$ and $End(\mathcal{S}) := Hom(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S})$ the set of endomorphisms on $\mathcal{S}$.

Let $G_2 = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} * \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} = \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle$ be the free product of the cyclic groups of order two with generators a_1 and a_2. For two subspaces E_1 and E_2 of a Hilbert space H, let e_1 and e_2 be the projections onto E_1 and E_2. Then $u_1 = 2e_1 - I$ and $u_2 = 2e_2 - I$ are self-adjoint unitaries. Thus there is a bijective correspondence between the set $\mathcal{S}ys^2(H)$ of systems $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2)$ of two subspaces in a Hilbert space H and the set $Rep(G_2, H)$ of unitary representations π of G_2 on H such that $\pi(a_1) = u_1$ and $\pi(a_2) = u_2$. Similarly let $G_n = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} * ... * \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ be the n-times free product of the cyclic groups of order two. Then there is a bijective correspondence between the set $\mathcal{S}ys^n(H)$ of systems of n subspaces in a Hilbert space H and the set $Rep(G_n, H)$ of unitary representations of G_n on H.

Example 1. Let $H = \mathbb{C}^2$. Fix an angle θ with $0 < \theta < \pi/2$. Put $E_1 = \{\lambda(1, 0) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$ and $E_2 = \{\lambda(cos\theta, sin\theta) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$. Then $\mathcal{S}_1 = (H; E_1, E_2)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_2 = (\mathbb{C}^2; \mathbb{C} \oplus 0, 0 \oplus \mathbb{C})$. But the corresponding two unitary representations π_1 and π_2 are not similar, because $\frac{1}{2}(\pi_1(a_1)+1)\frac{1}{2}(\pi_1(a_2)+1) \neq 0$ and $\frac{1}{2}(\pi_2(a_1)+1)\frac{1}{2}(\pi_2(a_2)+1) = 0$.

We start with known facts to recall some notation. See [6] for example.

Let H be a Hilbert space and H_1 and H_2 be two subspaces of H. We write $H_1 \vee H_2 := \overline{H_1 + H_2}$ and $H_1 \wedge H_2 := H_1 \cap H_2$. Then the set of (closed) subspaces of H forms a lattice under these operations $\vee$ and $\wedge$. Two subspaces H_1 and H_2 are said to be topologically complementary if $H = H_1 \vee H_2$ and $H_1 \wedge H_2 = 0$. Two subspaces H_1 and H_2 are said to be algebraically complementary if $H = H_1 + H_2$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = 0$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let H be a Hilbert space and H_1 and H_2 be two subspaces of H. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *H_1 and H_2 are algebraically complementary, i.e., $H = H_1 + H_2$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = 0$.*
(2) *There exists a closed subspace $M \subset H$ such that $(H; H_1, H_2)$ is isomorphic to $(H; M, M^\perp)$*
(3) *There exists an idempotent $P \in B(H)$ such that $H_1 = \operatorname{Im} P$ and $H_2 = \operatorname{Im}(1 - P)$.*

Lemma 2.2 ([6])**.** *Let H and K be Hilbert spaces and $E \subset H$ and $F \subset K$ be closed subspaces of H and K. Let $e \in B(H)$ and $f \in B(K)$ be the projections onto E and F. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *There exists an invertible operator $T : H \to K$ such that $T(E) = F$.*
(2) *There exists an invertible operator $T : H \to K$ such that $e = (T^{-1}fT)e$ and $f = (TeT^{-1})f$.*

Using the above lemma, we can describe an isomorphism between two systems of n subspaces in terms of operators only as follows:

Corollary 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (H'; E'_1, \cdots, E'_n)$ be two systems of n-subspaces. Let e_i (resp. e'_i) be the projection onto E_i (resp. E'_i) . Then two systems $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ are isomorphic if and only if there exists an invertible operator $T : H \to H'$ such that $e_i = (T^{-1}e'_iT)e_i$ and $e'_i = (Te_iT^{-1})e'_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.*

Remark. If there exists an invertible operator $T : H \to H'$ such that $e'_i = Te_iT^{-1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then two systems $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ are isomorphic. But the converse is not true as in Example 1.

3. INDECOMPOSABLE SYSTEMS

In this section we shall introduce a notion of indecomposable system, that is, a system which cannot be decomposed into a direct sum of smaller systems anymore.

Definition (direct sum). Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (H'; E'_1, \cdots, E'_n)$ be systems of n subspaces in Hilbert spaces H and H'. Then their direct sum $\mathcal{S} \oplus \mathcal{S}'$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{S} \oplus \mathcal{S}' := (H \oplus H'; E_1 \oplus E'_1, \ldots, E_n \oplus E'_n).$$

Definition. (indecomposable system). A system $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ of n subspaces is called *decomposable* if the system $\mathcal{S}$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of two non-zero systems. A system $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ is said to be *indecomposable* if it is not decomposable.

Example 2. Let $H = \mathbb{C}^2$. Fix an angle θ with $0 < \theta < \pi/2$. Put $E_1 = \{\lambda(1, 0) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$ and $E_2 = \{\lambda(cos\theta, sin\theta) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$. Then $(H; E_1, E_2)$ is isomorphic to

$$(\mathbb{C}^2; \mathbb{C} \oplus 0, 0 \oplus \mathbb{C}) \cong (\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C}, 0) \oplus (\mathbb{C}; 0, \mathbb{C}).$$

Hence $(H; E_1, E_2)$ is decomposable.

Remark. Let e_1 and e_2 be the projections onto E_1 and E_2 in the Example above. Then the C^*-algebra $C^*(\{e_1, e_2\})$ generated by e_1 and e_2 is exactly $B(H) \cong M_2(\mathbb{C})$. Therefore the irreducibility of $C^*(\{e_1, e_2\})$ does *not* imply the indecomposability of $(H; E_1, E_2)$. Thus seeking an indecomposable system of subspaces is much more difficult and fundamental task than showing irreducibility of the C^*-algebra generated by the corresponding projections for the subspaces.

We can characterize decomposability of systems inside the ambient Hilbert space as in [6]

Let H be a Hilbert space and $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ a system of n subspaces. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

(1) $\mathcal{S}$ is decomposable.
(2) there exist non-zero closed subspaces H_1 and H_2 of H such that $H_1 + H_2 = H$, $H_1 \cap H_2 = 0$ and $E_i = E_i \cap H_1 + E_i \cap H_2$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

We give a condition of decomposability in terms of endomorphism algebras for the systems.

We put $Idem(\mathcal{S}) := \{T \in End(\mathcal{S}); T = T^2\}$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ be a system of n subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is indecomposable if and only if $Idem(\mathcal{S}) = \{0, I\}$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ be a system of n subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Let e_i be the projection of H onto E_i for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. If $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ is indecomposable, then the $C^*(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\})$ generated by $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ is irreducible. But the converse is not true.

Definition. Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ be a system of n subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Let e_i be the projection of H onto E_i for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. We say that $\mathcal{S}$ is a *commutative* system if the $C^*(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\})$ generated by $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ is commutative. Be careful that commutativity is *not* an isomorphic invariant as shown in Example 1. But it makes sense that a system is isomorphic to a commutative system.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ be a system of n subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Assume that $\mathcal{S}$ is a commutative system. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is indecomposable if and only if $\dim H = 1$. Moreover each subset $\Lambda \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ corresponds to a commutative system satisfying $\dim E_i = 1$ for $i \in \Lambda$ and $\dim E_i = 0$ for $i \notin \Lambda$.

Example 3. Let $H = \mathbb{C}^2$. Put $E_1 = \mathbb{C} \oplus 0$, $E_2 = 0 \oplus \mathbb{C}$ and $E_3 = \{(x, x)\ x \in \mathbb{C}\}$. Then $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ is indecomposable. The system $\mathcal{S}$ is the lowest dimensional one among non-commutative indecomposable systems. In fact, the system $\mathcal{S}$ forms a double triangle in the sense below. We see that distributive law fails:

$$(E_1 \vee E_2) \wedge E_3 \neq (E_1 \wedge E_2) \vee (E_1 \wedge E_3).$$

Definition. We say that a system $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H *forms a double triangle* if the family $\{H, E_1, E_2, E_3, 0\}$ is a double triangle lattice, (which is also called a diamond), that is,

$$E_i \vee E_j = H, \quad \text{and} \quad E_i \wedge E_j = 0, \quad (i \neq j, i, j = 1, 2, 3).$$

and each $E_i \neq H$, $E_i \neq 0$. We remark that the distributive law fails in any double triangle.

$$(E_1 \vee E_2) \wedge E_3 \neq (E_1 \wedge E_2) \vee (E_1 \wedge E_3).$$

Example 4. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} * \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} * \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} = \langle a_1, a_2, a_3 \rangle$ be the free product of the cyclic groups of order two with three generators

a_1, a_2 and a_3. Let λ be the left regular representation of G on $H = \ell^2(G)$. Then the reduced group C^*-algebra $C_r^*(G)$ is generatedby λ_{a_1}, λ_{a_2} and λ_{a_3}. Since these three generators are self-adjoint unitaries, $e_i := (\lambda_{a_i} + I)/2$, $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ are projections. Let $E_i = \mathrm{Im}\, e_i$. Then a system $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ of three subspaces forms a double triangle. In fact, let $x = \sum_g x_g \delta_g \in E_1 \cap E_2$. Since $e_i x = x$, we have $\lambda_{a_i} x = x$ for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore $x_{a_i g} = x_g$ for any $g \in G$. Since $\sum_h |x_h|^2 < \infty$, $x_g = 0$ for any g. Therefore $x = 0$. Hence $E_1 \cap E_2 = O$. The other conditions are similarly checked.

Definition. We say that a system $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H *forms a pentagon* (with $E_3 \supset E_2$) if the family $\{H, E_1, E_2, E_3, 0\}$ is a pentagon lattice (with $E_3 \supset E_2$), that is,

$$E_1 \vee E_2 = H, \quad E_1 \wedge E_3 = 0, \text{ and } E_3 \supset E_2 \text{ with } E_3 \neq E_2,$$

and each $E_i \neq H$, $E_i \neq 0$. We also say that $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ is a pentagon system.

Example 5. Let K be a Hilbert space and $A : K \to K$ a bounded operator such that A is one to one and $\mathrm{Im}\, A$ is dense in K and not equal to K. Put $H = K \oplus K$, $E_1 = K \oplus 0$ and $E_2 = \{(x, Ax) | x \in K\}$. Let $M \neq 0$ be a finite-dimensional subspace of K such that $M \cap \mathrm{Im}\, A = 0$. Put $E_3 = E_2 + (O, M)$. Then $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ is a pentagon system.

Recall that Halmos initiated the study of transitive lattices. A complete lattice of closed subspaces of a Hilbert space H containing 0 and H is called *transitive* if every bounded operator on H leaving each subspace invariant is a scalar multiple of the identity. Halmos gave an example of transitive lattice consisting of seven subspaces in [16]. Harrison-Radjavi-Rosenthal [17] constructed a transitive lattice consisting of six subspaces using the graph of an unbounded operator. Any finite transitive lattice which consists of n subspaces gives an indecomposable system of n-2 subspaces but the converse is not true. Following the study of transitive lattices, we shall introduce the notion of transitive system.

Definition. Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ be a system of n subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Then we say that $\mathcal{S}$ is *transitive* if $End(\mathcal{S}) = \mathbb{C} I_H$. Recall that $\mathcal{S}$ is indecomposable if and only if $Idem(\mathcal{S}) = \{0, I\}$. Hence if $\mathcal{S}$ is transitive, then $\mathcal{S}$ is indecomposable. But the converse is not true. In fact, the system

$$\mathcal{S}_S = (H; K \oplus 0, 0 \oplus K, \mathrm{graph}\, A, \{(x, x); x \in K\}).$$

of four subspaces associated with a unilateral shift S as above is indecomposable but is not transitive, because $End(\mathcal{S})$ contains $S \oplus S$.

Example 6.(Harrison-Radjavi-Rosenthal [17]) Let $K = \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ and $H = K \oplus K$. Consider a sequence $(\alpha_n)_n$ given by $\alpha_n = 1$ for $n \leq 0$ and

$\alpha_n = exp((-1)^n n!)$ for $n \geq 1$. Consider a bilateral weighted shift $S : \mathcal{D}_T \to K$ such that $T(x_n)_n = (\alpha_{n-1}x_{n-1})_n$ with the domain $\mathcal{D}_T = \{(x_n)_n \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}); \sum_n |\alpha_n x_n|^2 < \infty\}$. Let $E_1 = K \oplus 0$, $E_2 = 0 \oplus K$, $E_3 = \{(x, Tx) \in H; x \in \mathcal{D}_T\}$ and $E_4 = \{(x, x) \in H; x \in K\}$. Harrison, Radjavi and Rosenthal showed that $\{0, H, E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4\}$ is a transitive lattice. Hence the system $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4)$ of four subspaces in H is transitive and in particular indecomposable.

It is easy to see the case of indecomposable systems of one subspace even in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space.

Let H be a Hilbert space and $\mathcal{S} = (H; E)$ a system of one subspace. Then $\mathcal{S} = (H; E)$ is indecomposable if and only if $\mathcal{S} \cong (\mathbb{C}; 0)$ or $\mathcal{S} \cong (\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C})$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E)$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (H'; E')$ be two systems of one subspace. Then $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ are isomorphic if and only if $\dim E = \dim E'$ and $\operatorname{codim} E = \operatorname{codim} E'$.

It is a well known fact that the relative position of two subspaces E_1 and E_2 in a Hilbert space H can be described completely up to unitary equivalence. The Hilbert space H is the direct sum of five subspaces:

$$H = (E_1 \cap E_2) \oplus (\text{the rest}) \oplus (E_1 \cap E_2^\perp) \oplus (E_1^\perp \cap E_2) \oplus (E_1^\perp \cap E_2^\perp).$$

In the rest part, E_1 and E_2 are in generic position and the relative position is described only by "the angles" between them. In fact the rest part is written as $K \oplus K$ for some subspace K and there exist two positive operators $c, s \in B(K)$ with null kernels with $c^2 + s^2 = 1$ such that

$$E_1 = (E_1 \cap E_2) \oplus \operatorname{Im} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus (E_1 \cap E_2^\perp) \oplus 0 \oplus 0,$$

and

$$E_2 = (E_1 \cap E_2) \oplus \operatorname{Im} \begin{pmatrix} c^2 & cs \\ cs & s^2 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0 \oplus (E_1^\perp \cap E_2) \oplus 0.$$

By the functional calculus, there exists a unique positive operator θ, called the angle operator, such that $c = \cos\theta$ and $s = \sin\theta$ with $0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. We see that the algebraic sum $E_1 + E_2$ is closed if and only if $scK + s^2K = K$ if and only if s is invertible. And $E_1 + E_2^\perp$ is closed if and only if $E_1^\perp + E_2$ is closed if and only if c is invertible. We need the following fact:

Lemma 3.1. *Let E_1 and E_2 be two subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Let P_i be the projection of H onto E_i. If $E_1 + E_2$ is closed, then $T := (P_1 + P_2)|_{(E_1+E_2)} : E_1 + E_2 \to E_1 + E_2$ is an onto invertible operator.*

Proof. Since $E_1 + E_2$ is closed, s is invertible. Then it is easy to see that

$$T = I \oplus \begin{pmatrix} I + c^2 & cs \\ cs & s^2 \end{pmatrix} \oplus I \oplus I$$

is invertible, because the non-trivial component has the operator determinant $(I + c^2)s^2 - cscs = s^2$. □

Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2)$ be a system of two subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is indecomposable if and only if $\mathcal{S}$ is isomorphic to one of the following four commutative systems:

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = (\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C}, 0), \quad \mathcal{S}_2 = (\mathbb{C}; 0, \mathbb{C}), \mathcal{S}_3 = (\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}), \quad \mathcal{S}_4 = (\mathbb{C}; 0, 0).$$

4. Brenner type decomposition

We introduce a Brenner type decomposition which is a generalization of a Brenner decomposition of a system of three subspaces in a finite dimensional Hilbert space.

Definition. Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is said to have a *Brenner type decomposition* if $\mathcal{S}$ is isomorphic to a system $\mathcal{T} = (H; F_1, F_2, F_3)$ satisfying that there exist subspaces $S, N_1, N_2, N_3, M_1, M_2, M_3, Q, L$ of H such that $(Q; Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$ forms a double triangle and

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= S \oplus N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus N_3 \oplus M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3 \oplus Q \oplus L \\
F_1 &= S \oplus 0 \quad \oplus N_2 \oplus N_3 \oplus M_1 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus 0 \quad \oplus Q_1 \oplus 0 \\
F_2 &= S \oplus N_1 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus N_3 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus M_2 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus Q_2 \oplus 0 \\
F_3 &= S \oplus N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus 0 \quad \oplus 0 \quad \oplus 0 \quad \oplus M_3 \oplus Q_3 \oplus 0
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Assume that $(H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ forms a double triangle. Then the followings are equivalent:*

(1) *Linear sums $E_i + E_j$ are closed for any $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $i \neq j$.*

(2) *$\mathcal{S}$ is isomorphic to a typical form, i.e.*

$$(H; H_1, H_2, H_3) \cong (K \oplus K; K \oplus 0, 0 \oplus K, \{(x, x) \mid x \in K\})$$

for some Hilbert space K.

Proof. It is trivial that (2) implies (1). Conversely, assume (1). Since $H = E_1 + E_2$ and $E_1 \cap E_2 = 0$, we may and do assume that $E_2 = E_1^\perp$ up to isomorphism. Apply two subspace theorem for E_1 and E_3. Since $E_1 \cap E_3 = 0$ and $E_1^\perp \cap E_3^\perp = 0$, The Hilbert space H is the direct sum of three subspaces:

$$H = (K \oplus K) \oplus (E_1 \cap E_3^\perp) \oplus (E_1^\perp \cap E_3).$$

for some subspace K and there exist two positive operators $c, s \in B(K)$ with null kernels with $c^2 + s^2 = 1$ such that

$$E_1 = \mathrm{Im} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus (E_1 \cap E_3^\perp) \oplus 0,$$

and

$$E_3 = \mathrm{Im}\begin{pmatrix} c^2 & cs \\ cs & s^2 \end{pmatrix} \oplus 0 \oplus (E_1^{\perp} \cap E_3).$$

Since $E_2 \cap E_3 = 0$, we have that $E_1^{\perp} \cap E_3 = 0$. Since $E_2 \vee E_3 = H$, we have that $E_1 \cap E_3^{\perp} = 0$. Moreover

$$\mathrm{Im}\begin{pmatrix} c^2 & cs \\ cs & s^2 \end{pmatrix} = \{\begin{pmatrix} cz \\ sz \end{pmatrix} \mid z \in K\},$$

because $c + s$ is invertible.

Since $E_1 + E_3$ is closed, s is invertible. Since $E_1^{\perp} + E_3 = E_2 + E_3$ is closed, c is invertible. Consider an invertible operator

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} c^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & s^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then $TE_1 = K \oplus 0$, $TE_2 = 0 \oplus K$ and $TE_3 = \{\binom{z}{z} \mid z \in K\}$. This completes the proof. □

We need the following Theorem after [8, Corollary 4.1] by Feshchenko who studies closedness of the sum of n subspaces of a Hilbert space. Let $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ be subspaces of a Hilbert space. Then $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ are said to be linearly independent if for any $x_i \in H_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$, if $x_1 + \ldots x_n = 0$, then $x_1 = \cdots = x_n = 0$. They are linearly independent if and only if the representation $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_n$ for $x_i \in H_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$ is unique if and only if

$$H_i \cap (\sum_{\{j; j \neq i\}} H_j) = 0$$

for any $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Theorem 4.2 ([8])**.** *Let $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ be linear independent subspaces of a Hilbert space H. If $H = H_1 + \cdots + H_n$, then for any collection of subscripts $i(1), \ldots, i(k)$, the sum $H_{i(1)} + \cdots + H_{i(k)}$ is closed.*

Using the Feshchenko's Theorem above, we can extend Lemma 2.1 to n-subspaces.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ be n-subspaces of a Hilbert space H. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *$H = H_1 + \cdots + H_n$ and $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ are linearly independent.*
(2) *H is isomorphic to an outer orthogonal sum $H_1 \oplus H_2 \cdots \oplus H_n$, i.e., there exists an invertible operator $T : H \to H_1 \oplus H_2 \cdots \oplus H_n$ such that $T(H_i) = 0 \oplus H_i \oplus 0$.*

Proof. Assume (1). By the Feshchenko's Theorem above, $H_1 + H_2$ is closed. Since H_1 and H_2 are linearly independent, $H_1 + H_2$ is isomorphic to an outer orhtogonal sum $H_1 \oplus H_2$ by Lemma 2.1. Since $(H_1 \oplus H_2) + H_3$ is closed by the Feshchenko's theorem and $(H_1 \oplus H_2)$ and H_3 are linearly independent, $(H_1 \oplus H_2) + H_3$ is isomorphic to an outer orhtogonal sum

$H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus H_3$ by Lemma 2.1. Inductively we can show (2). The converse is clear. □

The failure of the ditributive law is measured by the inclusions:

$$((E_i \wedge E_j) \vee (E_i \wedge E_k)) \subset (E_i \wedge (E_j \vee E_k))$$

Therefore the finite dimensonality of its quotient space is a slight generalization of the finite dimensionality of the ambient space H.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Then the followings are equivalent:*

(1) *Linear sums $E_i + E_j$ and $(E_i \cap E_k) + (E_j \cap E_k)$ are closed for $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $i \neq j \neq k \neq i$ and the quotient space $(E_3 \wedge (E_1 \vee E_2))/((E_3 \wedge E_1) \vee (E_3 \wedge E_2))$ is finite-dimensional.*

(2) *$\mathcal{S}$ has a Brenner type decomposition with a finite-dimensional double triangle part Q.*

Moreover if these equivalent conditions are satisfied, then the double triangle part Q is isomorphic to a typical form, i.e.

$$(Q; Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) \cong (K \oplus K; K \oplus 0, 0 \oplus K, \{(x, x) \ | x \in K\})$$

for some Hilbert space K.

Proof. It is trival that (2) implies (1). Conversely, assume (1). Let

$$Q_3 = (E_3 \wedge (E_1 \vee E_2)) \cap ((E_3 \wedge E_1) \vee (E_3 \wedge E_2))^{\perp}$$

Then Q_3 is finite-dmensional by the assumption and

$$(E_3 \wedge (E_1 \vee E_2)) = ((E_3 \wedge E_1) \vee (E_3 \wedge E_2)) \oplus Q_3$$

Let P_i be the projection of H onto E_i. Since $E_1 + E_2$ is closed, $T := (P_1 + P_2)|_{(E_1+E_2)} : E_1 + E_2 \to E_1 + E_2$ is an onto invertible operator by Lemma 3.1. Put $A_1 = P_1 T^{-1}$ and $A_2 = P_2 T^{-1}$. Then $A_1 + A_2 = id|_{E_1+E_2}$. Put $Q_1 := A_1(Q_3) \subset E_1$ and $Q_2 := A_2(Q_3) \subset E_2$. Then Q_1 and Q_2 are finite-dimensional. For any $q_3 \in Q_3$, put $q_1 = A_1 q_3 \in Q_1$ and $q_2 = A_2 q_3 \in Q_2$. Then $q_1 + q_2 = q_3$. Let $Q := Q_1 + Q_2$. Then

$$Q = Q_1 + Q_2 = Q_2 + Q_3 = Q_3 + Q_1.$$

Moreover $Q_2 \cap Q_3 = 0$. In fact, $Q_2 \cap Q_3 \subset E_2 \cap E_3$ and $Q_2 \cap Q_3 \subset Q_3 \subset (E_2 \cap E_3)^{\perp}$. Similarly we have $Q_1 \cap Q_3 = 0$. Let $q \in Q_1 \cap Q_2$. Then there exists $q_3 \in Q_3$ such that $q = A_1 q_3$ and

$$q_3 = A_1 q_3 + A_2 q_3 = q + A_2 q_3 \in Q_2 + Q_2 = Q_2$$

Thus $q_3 \in Q_3 \cap Q_2 = 0$. Hence $q = A_1 q_3 = 0$. This shows that $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = 0$. Therefore $(Q; Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$ forms a double triangle.

We shall show that

$$(E_1 \cap (E_2 + E_3)) = ((E_1 \cap E_2) + (E_1 \cap E_3)) \oplus_{alg} Q_1$$

Since $Q_1 \subset E_1$ and $Q_1 \subset Q_2 + Q_3 \subset (E_2 + E_3)$,

$$(E_1 \cap (E_2 + E_3)) \supset ((E_1 \cap E_2) + (E_1 \cap E_3)) + Q_1$$

Conversely let $x_1 \in (E_1 \cap (E_2 + E_3))$. Then there exist $x_2 \in E_2$ and $x_3 \in E_3$ such that $x_1 = x_2 + x_3$. Since

$$x_3 = x_1 - x_2 \in E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2) = ((E_3 \cap E_1) + (E_3 \cap E_2)) + Q_3,$$

there exist $y_1 \in E_3 \cap E_1$, $y_2 \in E_3 \cap E_2$ and $q_3 \in Q_3$ such that $x_3 = y_1 + y_2 + q_3$. Since $Q_3 \subset Q_1 + Q_2$, there exist $q_1 \in Q_1$ and $q_2 \in Q_2$ such that $q_3 = q_1 + q_2$. Then we have that

$$x_1 - x_2 = x_3 = y_1 + y_2 + q_3 = y_1 + y_2 + q_1 + q_2.$$

Put

$$z_{12} := x_1 - y_1 - q_1 = y_2 + x_2 + q_2 \in E_1 \cap E_2.$$

Then

$$x_1 = q_1 + y_1 + z_{12} \in Q_1 + E_3 \cap E_1 + E_1 \cap E_2$$

This implies that

$$(E_1 \cap (E_2 + E_3)) \subset ((E_1 \cap E_2) + (E_1 \cap E_3)) + Q_1$$

We shall show that $((E_1 \cap E_2) + (E_1 \cap E_3)) \cap Q_1 = 0$. Let $q_1 \in ((E_1 \cap E_2) + (E_1 \cap E_3)) \cap Q_1$. Then there exist $y \in E_1 \cap E_2$ and $z \in E_1 \cap E_3$ such that $q_1 = y + z$. Since $q_1 \in Q_1$, there exists $q_3 \in Q_3$ such that $q_1 = A_1 q_3$. Put $q_2 = A_2 q_3$. Then $q_3 = q_1 + q_2$. Hence $y + z = q_1 = q_3 - q_2$. Put

$$s := z - q_3 = -y - q_2 \in E_3 \cap E_2.$$

Then $q_3 = z - s \in (E_3 \cap E_1) + (E_3 \cap E_2)$. Hence $q_3 \in Q_3 \cap ((E_3 \cap E_1) + (E_3 \cap E_2)) = 0$. Thus $q_1 = A_1 q_3 = 0$. Therefore we have that

$$(E_1 \cap (E_2 + E_3)) = ((E_1 \cap E_2) + (E_1 \cap E_3)) \oplus_{alg} Q_1$$

Similarly we have that

$$(E_2 \cap (E_1 + E_3)) = ((E_2 \cap E_1) + (E_2 \cap E_3)) \oplus_{alg} Q_2$$

Put

$$M_1 := E_1 \cap (E_1 \cap (E_2 + E_3))^{\perp}$$
$$M_2 := E_2 \cap (E_2 \cap (E_3 + E_1))^{\perp}$$
$$M_3 := E_3 \cap (E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2))^{\perp}$$

Then we have that

$$E_1 = M_1 \oplus (E_1 \cap (E_2 + E_3)), \quad E_2 = M_2 \oplus (E_2 \cap (E_3 + E_1))$$

and

$$E_3 = M_3 \oplus (E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2))$$

Put $S := E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3$ and

$$N_1 := E_2 \cap E_3 \cap S^{\perp}, \quad N_2 := E_3 \cap E_1 \cap S^{\perp} \quad \text{and } N_3 := E_1 \cap E_2 \cap S^{\perp}.$$

Then we have that

$$E_2 \cap E_3 = S \oplus N_1, \quad E_3 \cap E_1 = S \oplus N_2 \quad \text{and } E_1 \cap E_2 = S \oplus N_3.$$

Put $L := (E_1 + E_2 + E_3)^{\perp} \cap H$. Moreover

$$E_1 = M_1 + ((E_1 \cap E_2) + (E_1 \cap E_3)) + Q_1 = S + N_2 + N_3 + M_1 + Q_1$$

Similarly we also have that

$$E_2 = S + N_1 + N_3 + M_2 + Q_2, \quad \text{and } E_3 = S + N_1 + N_2 + M_3 + Q_3.$$

Therefore

$$E_1 + E_2 + E_3 = S + N_1 + N_2 + N_3 + M_1 + M_2 + M_3 + Q$$

and

$$H = (E_1 + E_2 + E_3) + L = S + N_1 + N_2 + N_3 + M_1 + M_2 + M_3 + Q + L.$$

Finally we shall show that the linear sum of the right-hand side is in fact an algebraic direct sum. We need to show that $S, N_1, N_2, N_3, M_1, M_2, M_3, Q$ and L are linearly indepenent. Let

$$s + n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + q_1 + q_2 + \ell = 0$$

for $s \in S, n_1 \in N_1, n_2 \in N_2, n_3 \in N_3, m_1 \in M_1, m_2 \in M_2, m_3 \in M_3, q_1 \in Q_1, q_2 \in Q_2$ and $\ell \in L$. Then it is clear that $\ell = 0$. Therefore

$$-m_3 = (n_2+m_1+q_1)+(n_1+m_2+q_2)+(n_3+s) \in E_1+E_2+E_1\cap E_2 \subset E_1+E_2.$$

Therefore $m_3 \in M_3 \cap (E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)) = 0$. Thus $m_3 = 0$. Since

$$q_1 + q_2 = q_2' + q_3' = q_3'' + q_1''$$

for some $q_2 \in Q_2$, $q_3', q_3'' \in Q_3$ and $q_1'' \in Q_1$,. we similarly have that $m_1 = m_2 = 0$. Hence

$$s + n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + q_1 + q_2 = 0.$$

Put $w := n_1 + q_2 = -(n_2 + n_3 + q_1) \in E_2 \cap E_1$. Then

$$q_2 = w - n_1 \in (E_2 \cap E_1) + (E_2 \cap E_3)$$

Since $q_2 \in Q_2 \cap ((E_2 \cap E_1) + (E_2 \cap E_3)) = 0$, we have that $q_2 = 0$. Similarly we have that $q_1 = 0$. Therefore $s + n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = 0$. Since

$$E_1 \cap E_2 \ni s + n_3 = -n_1 - n_2 \in E_3,$$

$s + n_3 \in (E_1 \cap E_2) \cap E_3 = S$. Thus $n_3 \in S \cap N_3 = 0$. Therefore $n_3 = 0$. Similarly we have that $n_1 = n_2 = 0$. Hence $s = 0$. Finally Theorem 4.3 implies the conclusion. The rest is clear by Proposition 4.1.

□

As a Corollary, we get the original Brenner's theorem.

Corollary 4.5 ([3], [23]). *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a finite dimensional Hilbert space H. Then $\mathcal{S}$ has a Brenner type decomposition.*

Remark. Even if an ambient space H is finite-dimensional, a double triangle part is not uniquely determined in a Brenner type decomposition. In fact, let $H = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, $E_1 = \mathbb{C} \oplus 0 \oplus \mathbb{C}$, $E_2 = 0 \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ and $E_3 = \{x(1,1,1) \in H \mid x \in \mathbb{C}\}$. Put $N_3 = 0 \oplus 0 \oplus \mathbb{C}$. Put $S = N_1 = N_2 = M_1 = M_2 = M_3 = L = 0$. Let $Q_3 = E_3$, $Q_1 = \{x(1,0,1/2) \in H \mid x \in \mathbb{C}\}$ and $Q_2 = \{x(0,1,1/2) \in H \mid x \in \mathbb{C}\}$ This gives a Brenner type decomposition. We have another Brenner type decompositin by $Q'_3 = E_3$, $Q'_1 = \{x(1,0,1/3) \in H \mid x \in \mathbb{C}\}$ and $Q'_2 = \{x(0,1,2/3) \in H \mid x \in \mathbb{C}\}$ and the others are the same as the first one. Since $Q := Q_1 + Q_2 \neq Q' := Q'_1 + Q'_2$, they provide two kinds of Brenner type decompositions.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces which has a Brenner type decomposition. Then it is clear that for any $i, j, k = 1, 2, 3$ with $i \neq j$, $j \neq k$ and $k \neq i$,

$$\overline{E_i + E_j} + E_k \quad \text{and} \quad (E_i \cap E_j) + E_k$$

are closed in H. We shall show that this topological property characterize a system of three subspaces which have a Brenner type decomposition.

Example 7. Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. If $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ forms a pentagon (with $E_1 \supset E_2$), then neither $E_1 + E_3$ nor $E_2 + E_3$ are closed. Therefore $\overline{E_1 + E_2} + E_3 = E_1 + E_2$ is not closed and $(E_1 \cap E_2) + E_3 = E_2 + E_3$ is not closed. Hence $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ does not have a Brenner type decomposition. Thus this closedness property excludes pentagons to have a Brenner type decomposition.

We shall split out a distributive part and a double triangle part step by step.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Suppose that $(E_1 \cap E_2) + E_3$ is closed. Then there exist systems $\mathcal{S}' = (H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3)$ and $\mathcal{S}'' = (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3)$ of three subspaces such that*

(1) $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3) \cong (H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3) \oplus (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3)$.
(2) $E''_1 \cap E''_2 = 0$
(3) $E'_3 \subset E'_1 = E'_2$ *("distributive component ")*

Proof. Consider two subspace decomposition for $F := E_1 \cap E_2$ and E_3. Since $(E_1 \cap E_2) + E_3$ is closed, we may and do assume that there exits no angle part for $F := E_1 \cap E_2$ and E_3 up to isomorphism. Therefore we have the following decomposition:

$$H = (E_1 \cap E_2) \cap E_3 \oplus (E_1 \cap E_2) \cap E_3^{\perp} \oplus (E_1 \cap E_2)^{\perp} \cap E_3 \oplus (E_1 \cap E_2)^{\perp} \cap E_3^{\perp}$$

$$E_1 \cap E_2 = (E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3) \oplus (E_1 \cap E_2) \cap E_3^{\perp} \oplus \quad 0 \quad \oplus \quad 0$$

$$E_3 = (E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3) \oplus \quad 0 \quad \oplus (E_1 \cap E_2)^{\perp} \cap E_3 \oplus \quad 0$$

Then put $H' := E_1 \cap E_2$ and $H'' := (E_1 \cap E_2)^\perp$. Consider corresponding decompositions for $H = H' \oplus H''$. By taking intersections with H' and H'', let

$$E_1' = E_1 \cap (E_1 \cap E_2) = E_1 \cap E_2, \quad E_2' = E_2 \cap (E_1 \cap E_2) = E_1 \cap E_2,$$

and

$$E_3' = E_3 \cap (E_1 \cap E_2) = E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3$$

$$E_1'' = E_1 \cap (E_1 \cap E_2)^\perp,$$
$$E_2'' = E_2 \cap (E_1 \cap E_2)^\perp,$$
$$E_3'' = E_3 \cap (E_1 \cap E_2)^\perp$$

Then clearly we have that

$$E_1' + E_1'' = E_1 \quad E_2' + E_2'' = E_2 \quad \text{and } E_3' + E_3'' = E_3$$

Moreover we have that $E_3' \subset E_1' = E_2'$ and $E_1'' \cap E_2'' = 0$.

□

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Suppose that $(E_1 \vee E_2) + E_3$ is closed. Then there exist systems $\mathcal{S}' = (H'; E_1', E_2', E_3')$ and $\mathcal{S}'' = (H''; E_1'', E_2'', E_3'')$ of three subspaces such that*

(1) $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3) \cong (H'; E_1', E_2', E_3') \oplus (H''; E_1'', E_2'', E_3'')$.
(2) $E_1'' \vee E_2'' = H''$
(3) $E_1' = E_2' = 0 \subset E_3'$ *("distributive component ")*

Proof. Consider two subspace decomposition for $F := E_1 \vee E_2$ and E_3. Since $(E_1 \vee E_2) + E_3$ is closed, we may and do assume that there exits no angle part for $F := E_1 \vee E_2$ and E_3 up to isomorphism. Therefore we have the following decomposition:

$$H = (E_1 \vee E_2) \cap E_3 \oplus (E_1 \vee E_2) \cap E_3^\perp \oplus (E_1 \vee E_2)^\perp \cap E_3 \oplus (E_1 \vee E_2)^\perp \cap E_3^\perp$$
$$E_1 \vee E_2 = (E_1 \vee E_2) \cap E_3 \oplus (E_1 \vee E_2) \cap E_3^\perp \oplus \quad 0 \quad \oplus \quad 0$$
$$E_3 = (E_1 \vee E_2) \cap E_3 \oplus \quad 0 \quad \oplus (E_1 \vee E_2)^\perp \cap E_3 \oplus \quad 0$$

Then put $H' := (E_1 \vee E_2)^\perp$ and $H'' := (E_1 \vee E_2)$. Consider corresponding decompositions for $H = H' \oplus H''$. By taking intersections with H' and H'', let

$$E_1' = (E_1 \vee E_2)^\perp E_1 = 0, \quad E_2' = (E_1 \vee E_2)^\perp E_2 = 0, \quad E_3' = (E_1 \vee E_2)^\perp \cap E_3$$

$$E_1'' = (E_1 \vee E_2) \cap E_1 = E_1,$$
$$E_2'' = (E_1 \vee E_2) \cap E_2 = E_2,$$
$$E_3'' = (E_1 \vee E_2) \cap E_3,$$

Then clearly we have that

$$E_1' + E_1'' = E_1 \quad E_2' + E_2'' = E_2 \quad \text{and } E_3' + E_3'' = E_3$$

Moreover we have that $E'_1 = E'_2 = 0 \subset E'_3$ and $E''_1 \vee E''_2 = H''$.

□

Lemma 4.8. *Let H be a Hilbert space and H_1 and H_2 be two closed subspaces of H. Assume that $H = H_1 + H_2$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = 0$. Let F_i be an algebraic linear subspace of H_i for $i = 1, 2$. Consider their algebraic linear sum $F := F_1 + F_2$ in H. Then F is closed if and only if F_1 and F_2 are closed.*

Proof. There exists a closed subspace $M \subset H$ such that $(H; H_1, H_2)$ is isomorphic to $(H; M, M^\perp)$. Then the statement is redeuced to this case where the statement is clear. □

By the Lemma above, we have immediately have the followings:

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Suppose that there exist systems $\mathcal{S}' = (H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3)$ and $\mathcal{S}'' = (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3)$ of three subspaces such that*

$$\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3) \cong (H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3) \oplus (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3).$$

Then the followings hold:

1. *$(E_1 \cap E_2) + E_3$ is closed in H if and only if $(E'_1 \cap E'_2) + E'_3$ is closed in H' and $(E''_1 \cap E''_2) + E''_3$ is closed in H''.*
2. *$(E_1 \vee E_2) + E_3$ is closed in H if and only if $(E'_1 \vee E'_2) + E_3$ is closed in H' and $(E'_1 \vee E'_2) + E'_3$ is closed in H''.*
3. *$E_1 \cap E_2 = 0$ if and only if $E'_1 \cap E'_2 = 0$ and $E''_1 \cap E''_2 = 0$.*
4. *$E_1 \vee E_2 = H$ if and only if $E'_1 \vee E'_2 = H'$ and $E''_1 \vee E''_2 = H''$*

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Then the followings are equivalent:*

1. *Linear sums $(E_i \vee E_j) + E_k$ and $(E_i \cap E_j) + E_k$ are closed for $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $i \neq j \neq k \neq i$.*
2. *$\mathcal{S}$ has a Brenner type decomposition.*

Proof. It is trival that (2) implies (1). Conversely, assume (1). Since $(E_1 \cap E_2) + E_3$ is closed, there exist systems $\mathcal{S}' = (H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3)$ and $\mathcal{S}'' = (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3)$ of three subspaces such that

1. $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3) \cong (H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3) \oplus (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3)$.
2. $E''_1 \cap E''_2 = 0$
3. $E'_3 \subset E'_1 = E'_2$ ("distributive component ")

Since $(E''_1 \vee E''_2) + E''_3$ is closed. Then there exist systems $\mathcal{S}''' = (H'''; E'''_1, E'''_2, E'''_3)$ and $\mathcal{S}'''' = (H''''; E''''_1, E''''_2, E''''_3)$ of three subspaces such that

1. $\mathcal{S}'' = (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3) \cong (H'''; E'''_1, E'''_2, E'''_3) \oplus (H''''; E''''_1, E''''_2, E''''_3)$.
2. $E''''_1 \vee E''''_2 = H''''$
3. $E'''_1 = E'''_2 = 0 \subset E'''_3$ ("distributive component ")

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} &= (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)\\ &\cong (H'; E_1', E_2', E_3') \oplus (H'''; E_1''', E_2''', E_3''') \oplus (H''''; E_1'''', E_2'''', E_3'''')\end{aligned}$$

Moreover $E_1'''' \vee E_2'''' = H''''$ and $E_1'''' \cap E_2'''' = 0$. We shall split out a distributive part and a double triangle part step by step using Lemma 4.6, Lemma 4.7, Lemma 4.8 and Lemma 4.9. Since closedness property is preserved after we split out one step, we can proceed the next step.

Finally we can split out a double triangle part $(Q; Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$, because in the final step we have that

$$Q_i \vee Q_j = Q, \quad \text{and} \quad Q_i \wedge Q_j = 0, \quad (i \neq j, i, j = 1, 2, 3).$$

and the rest part consists of finite direct sum of distributive systems of three subspaces. Hence we have (2). □

5. DENSE DECOMPOSITION

In an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space H, the algebraic linear sum $H'+H''$ of closed subspaces H' and H'' is not necessarily closed. Therefore we cannot expect direct sum decomposition in general.

Example 8. Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Suppose that $E_1 \cap E_2 = 0$ and $E_1 + E_2$ is not closed and $E_1 \vee E_2 = \overline{E_1 + E_2} = E_3 = H$. Put $H' = E_1$ and $H'' = E_2$. Then H has a "dense decomposition" $H = \overline{H' + H''}$ such that $H' \cap H'' = 0$. $E_1 = E_1 + 0$, $E_2 = 0 + E_2$ and $E_3 = \overline{E_1 + E_2}$

Definition. Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H and let $\mathcal{S}^{(k)} = (H^{(k)}; E_1^{(k)}, E_2^{(k)}, E_3^{(k)})$ be systems of three subspaces in a Hilbert space $H^{(k)}$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is said to have a dense decomposition

$$\mathcal{S} \supset \mathcal{S}^{(1)} \oplus_{alg} \cdots \oplus_{alg} \mathcal{S}^{(m)} \quad (dense)$$

if $H = \overline{H^{(1)} \oplus_{alg} \cdots \oplus_{alg} H^{(m)}}$, $E_1 = \overline{E_1^{(1)} \oplus_{alg} \cdots \oplus_{alg} E_1^{(m)}}$, $E_2 = \overline{E_2^{(1)} \oplus_{alg} \cdots \oplus_{alg} E_2^{(m)}}$ and $E_3 = \overline{E_3^{(1)} \oplus_{alg} \cdots \oplus_{alg} E_3^{(m)}}$. In particular, $H^{(1)}, \ldots . H^{(m)}$ are linearly independent.

In geneal, we define a dense decomposition of a system of n-subspaces similarly.

For example,any system of two subspaces $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2)$has a dense decomposition satisfying distributive law. In fact,

$$(E_1 \cap E_2) \oplus_{alg} (K \oplus O) \oplus_{alg} \mathrm{Im} \begin{pmatrix} c^2 & cs \\ cs & s^2 \end{pmatrix} \oplus_{alg} (E_1 \cap E_2^{\perp}) \oplus_{alg} (E_1^{\perp} \cap E_2) \oplus_{alg} (E_1^{\perp} \cap E_2^{\perp}).$$

is a dense decomposition of H. We expect that a certain class of systems $\mathcal{S}$ of three subspaces has a dense decomposition with a distributive part

H^{dis}, a double triangle part Q and six kinds of pentagon parts

$$H^\sigma = \overline{\sum_{\sigma\in S_3}(E^\sigma_{\sigma(1)} \oplus_{alg} E^\sigma_{\sigma(3)})}$$

(with $E^\sigma_{\sigma(3)} \supset E^\sigma_{\sigma(2)}$), for a permutation $\sigma \in S_3$ on three letters $\{1,2,3\}$.

A distributive part is an algebraic sum of $2^3 = 8$ components

$$H^{dis} = S \oplus_{alg} N_1 \oplus_{alg} N_2 \oplus_{alg} N_3 \oplus_{alg} M_1 \oplus_{alg} M_2 \oplus_{alg} M_3 \oplus_{alg} L$$

and a double triangle part is a Hilbert space Q with

$$Q = \overline{Q_1 \oplus_{alg} Q_2} = \overline{Q_2 \oplus_{alg} Q_3} = \overline{Q_3 \oplus_{alg} Q_1}.$$

Then $(H^\sigma; E^\sigma_1, E^\sigma_2, E^\sigma_3)$ form pentagons (with $E^\sigma_{\sigma(3)} \supset E^\sigma_{\sigma(2)}$), so that

$E^\sigma_{\sigma(1)} \vee E^\sigma_{\sigma(2)} = H^\sigma$, $E^\sigma_{\sigma(1)} \wedge E^\sigma_{\sigma(3)} = 0$, and $E^\sigma_{\sigma(3)} \supset E^\sigma_{\sigma(2)}$ with $E^\sigma_{\sigma(3)} \neq E^\sigma_{\sigma(2)}$.

In this way

$$S \oplus_{alg} N_1 \oplus_{alg} N_2 \oplus_{alg} N_3 \oplus_{alg} M_1 \oplus_{alg} M_2 \oplus_{alg} M_3 \oplus_{alg} L \oplus_{alg} Q \oplus_{alg} \sum_{\sigma\in S_3}(E^\sigma_{\sigma(1)} \oplus_{alg} E^\sigma_{\sigma(3)})$$

is dense in H.

But we do not know whether this kinds of decompostion hold or not in general.

Finally we give a partial result which gives a condition on a system to have a (dense) decomposition containing a pentagon.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Suppose that there exist systems $\mathcal{S}' = (H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3)$ and $\mathcal{S}'' = (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3)$ of three subspaces such that*

(1) $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3) \cong (H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3) \oplus (H''; E''_1, E''_2, E''_3)$.
(2) $(H'; E'_1, E'_2, E'_3)$ *forms a pentagon (with $E'_3 \supset E'_2$).*
(3) *(distributive component) there exist subspaces N_1, N_2 and M_1 of H'' such that*

$$H'' = N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus M_1,$$

$$E''_1 = 0 \oplus N_2 \oplus M_1,\ E''_2 = N_1 \oplus 0 \oplus 0 \text{ and } E''_3 = N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus 0.$$

Then $E_1 \wedge E_2 = 0$, $E_1 \vee E_2 = H$ and $E_2 \subsetneqq E_3$.

Proof. It is clear. □

We can rearrange the above decomposition such that $(H'; E'_1 \oplus M_1, E'_2 \oplus N_1, E'_3 \oplus N_1)$ forms a pentagon (with $E'_3 \oplus N_1 \supset E'_2 \oplus N_1$) and $(N_2; N_2, 0, N_2)$ is a distributive part.

We shall show that the converse of the Lemma above holds in the sense of dense decomposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (H; E_1, E_2, E_3)$ be a system of three subspaces in a Hilbert space H. Suppose that*

$$E_1 \wedge E_2 = 0, E_1 \vee E_2 = H \text{ and } E_2 \subsetneqq E_3.$$

We assume that E_3/E_2 is finite dimensional. Then we have the following:

(i)*If $E_3 \neq E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)$, then there exist subspaces E_1', E_2', E_3' and N_2 of H such that*

(1) *$H \supset E_1' \oplus_{alg} E_3' \oplus_{alg} N_2$ (dense)*
(2) *$(E_1' \vee \underline{E_3'}; E_1', E_2', E_3')$ forms a pentagon (with $E_3' \supset E_2'$).*
(3) *$E_1 = \overline{E_1' \oplus_{alg} N_2}$, $E_2 = E_2'$ and $E_3 = \overline{E_3' \oplus_{alg} N_2}$*

Moreover $(N_2; N_2, 0, N_2)$ is a distributive part.
(ii)*If $E_3 = E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)$, then there exist subspaces N_1, N_2 and M_1 of H such that*

$$H \supset N_1 \oplus_{alg} N_2 \oplus_{alg} M_1 \text{ (dense)} ,$$

$E_1 = 0 + N_2 + M_1$, $E_2 = N_1 + 0 + 0$ and $E_3 = N_1 + N_2 + 0$,

Proof. Case (i): Assume that $E_3 \neq E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)$.

Put $F_3 = E_3 \cap (E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2))^{\perp} \neq 0$. Then $E_3 = (E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)) \oplus F_3$. Since $E_3 \supset E_2$, F_3 is orthgonal to E_2. We shall show that

$$E_1 \cap (E_2 + F_3) = 0$$

In fact, let $x_1 = x_2 + f_3 \in E_1 \cap (E_2 + F_3)$ for $x_1 \in E_1$, $x_2 \in E_2$ and $f_3 \in F_3$. Then $f_3 = x_1 - x_2 \in E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)$. But f_3 is also in $(E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2))^{\perp}$. Hence $f_3 = 0$. Then $x_1 = x_2$ is in $E_1 \cap E_2 = 0$. Therefore $x_1 = x_2 = 0$.

Since E_3/E_2 is finite dimensional, we can find

$$u_1, \ldots, u_n \in E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2) (\supset E_2)$$

such that the quotient image $\overline{u_1}, \ldots, \overline{u_n}$ are linearly independent in the quotient E_3/E_2 and

$$E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2) = E_2 + [u_1, \ldots, u_n],$$

where $[u_1, \ldots, u_n]$ is a linear span of $u_1, \ldots, u_n$. In particular, $E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)$ is closed in H. Choose $v_1, \ldots, v_n \in E_1$ and $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in E_2$ such that

$$u_k = v_k + w_k \quad (k = 1, \ldots, n).$$

Since the quotient image $\overline{u_k} = \overline{v_k}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n$, we have that $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ are linearly independent.

Put $N_2 = [v_1, \ldots, v_n]$. Since $E_2 \subset E_3$, $v_k = u_k - w_k$ is also in E_3. Hence $N_2 \subset E_1 \cap E_3$. Since $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ are in E_2 , we have that

$$E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2) = E_2 + [v_1, \ldots, v_n],$$

Put $E_1' = E_1 \cap [v_1, \ldots, v_n]^{\perp}$, $E_2' = E_2$ and $E_3' = E_2 \oplus F_3$. Then

$$E_3 = (E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)) \oplus F_3 = (E_2 + [v_1, \ldots, v_n]) \oplus F_3.$$

We shall show that N_2, E_1', E_2 and F_3 are linearly independent. In fact, let $n_2 + x_1 + x_2 + f_3 = 0$ for $n_2 \in N_2, x_1 \in E_1', x_2 \in E_2$ and $f_3 \in F_3$. Then

$$n_2 + x_1 = -x_2 - f_3 \in E_1 \cap (E_2 + F_3) = 0.$$

Therefore $n_2 + x_1 = 0$ and $x_2 + f_3 = 0$. Since $N_2 \perp E_1'$ and $F_3 \perp E_2$, we have that $n_2 = x_1 = x_2 = f_3 = 0$. Since

$$E_1' \cap E_3' = E_1' \cap (E_2' + F_3) \subset E_1 \cap (E_2 + F_3) = 0,$$

$(E_1' \vee E_3'; E_1', E_2', E_3')$ forms a pentagon (with $E_3' \supset E_2'$). And $E_1 = \overline{E_1' \oplus_{alg} N_2}$, $E_2 = E_2'$ and $E_3 = \overline{E_3' \oplus_{alg} N_2}$.

Case (ii): Assume that $E_3 = E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2)$. Then $F_3 = E_3 \cap (E_3 \cap (E_1 + E_2))^{\perp} = 0$. We can similarly define u_k, v_k, w_k as above. Put $N_2 = [v_1, \ldots, v_n]$. Define $M_1 = E_1 \cap [v_1, \ldots, v_n]^{\perp}$, $N_1 = E_2$. Then $E_1 = N_2 \oplus M_1$ and $E_3 = N_1 + N_2$. Moreover $N_1 + N_2 + M_1 = E_2 + E_1$ is dense in H. And N_1, N_2 and M_1 are linearly independent. In fact, let $n_1 + n_2 + m_1 = 0$ for $n_1 \in N_1$,$n_2 \in N_2$ and $m_1 \in M_1$. Then $n_2 + m_1 = -n_1 \in E_1 \cap E_2 = 0$. Hence $n_2 + m_1 = n_1 = 0$. Since N_2 and M_1 are orthogonal, $n_2 = m_1 = 0$. Hence

$$H \supset N_1 \oplus_{alg} N_2 \oplus_{alg} M_1 \text{ (dense)} ,$$

□

Example 9.Let $K = \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ be the Hilbert space of square summable sequences. Let $A : K \to K$ be a diagonal operator such that $(Ax)_n = \frac{1}{n}x_n$ for $x = (x_n)_n \in K$. Then $\operatorname{Im} A$ is dense in K and not equal to K. Put $f = (1, 1/2, 1/3, \ldots, 1/n, \ldots) \in K$ and $v = (0, 1/2, 1/3, \ldots, 1/n, \ldots) \in K$. Then f and v are not in $\operatorname{Im} A$. Define $N_2 = \mathbb{C}(0, v)$, $H = K \oplus K$, $E_1 = (K \oplus 0) + N_2$, $E_2 = \{(x, Ax) | x \in K\}$ and $E_3 = E_2 + \mathbb{C}(0, f) + N_2$. Put $E_1' = K \oplus 0$, $E_2' = \{(x, Ax) | x \in K\}$ and $E_3' = E_2 + \mathbb{C}(0, f)$.Then $(E_1' \vee E_3'; E_1', E_2', E_3')$ forms a pentagon (with $E_3' \supset E_2'$).

References

[1] H. Araki, *A lattice of von Neumann algebras with the quantum theory of a free Bose field,* J. Math. Phys. 4(1963), 1343-1362.

[2] A. Botter, I. Gohberg, Yu. I. Karlovich, N. Krupnik, S. Roch, B. Silbermann and I. Spittokovsky, *Banach algebras generated by N idempotents and Application,* Singular Integral Operators and Related Topics, Birkhauser (1996), 19-54.

[3] S. Brenner, *Endomorphism algebras of vector spaces with distinguished sets of subspaces,* J. Algebra 6 (1967), 100-114.

[4] C. Davis, *Separation of two linear suspaces,* Acta Sci. Math. Szeged. 19 (1958), 172-187.

[5] J. Dixmier, *Position relative de deux variétés linéaires fermées dans un espace de Hilbert,* Rev. Sci. 86 (1948), 387-399.

[6] M. Enomoto and Y. Watatani, *Relative position of four subspaces in a Hilbert space,* Adv. Math. 201 (2006), 263-317.

[7] M. Enomoto and Y. Watatani, *Indecomposable representations of quivers on infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces,* J. Funct. Anal. **256** (2009), 959-991.
[8] I. S. Feshchenko, *On closedness of the sum of n subspaces of a Hilbert space,* Ukrainian Math. J., 63 (2012), 1566-1622.
[9] P. Gabriel, *Unzerlegbare Darstellungen I,* Manuscripta Math. 6 (1972), 71-103.
[10] I. M. Gelfand and V. A. Ponomarev, *Problems of linear algebra and classification of quadruples of subspaces in a finite-dimensional vector space,* Coll. Math. Spc. Bolyai 5, Tihany (1970), 163-237.
[11] G. Graetzer, *Lattice theory: Foundation,* Birkhaeuser, 2011.
[12] L. Ge and W. Yuan, *Kadison-Singer algebras, I: hyperfinite case,* Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 107 (2010), 1838-1843.
[13] L. Ge and W. Yuan, *Kadison-Singer algebras, II: general case,* Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 107 (2010), 4840-4844.
[14] D. W. Hadwin, W. E. Longstaff and P. Rosenthal, *Small transitive lattices,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 87 (1983), 121-124.
[15] P. R. Halmos, *Two subspaces,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 144(1969), 381-389.
[16] P. R. Halmos, *Ten problems in Hilbert space,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 76 (1970), 887-933.
[17] K.J. Harrison, H. Radjavi and P. Rosenthal, *A transitive medial subspace lattice*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 28 (1971), 119-121.
[18] S. Hu and Y. Xue, *C^*-algebras generated by three projections*, arXiv:1207.6890[math.OA]
[19] C.Jian and Z.X Wang, *Strongly Irreducible Operators on Hilbert Space*, Longman, 1998.
[20] V. Jones, *Index for subfactors,* Inv. Math. 72(1983), 1-25.
[21] S. Kruglyak, V. Rabanovich and Y. Samoilenko, *On sums of projections,* Functional Anal. Appl., 36(2002), 182-195.
[22] S. Kruglyak and Y. Samoilenko, *On the complexity of description of representations of $*$-algebras generated by idempotents,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 128(2000), 1655-1664.
[23] Y. Moskaleva and Y. Samoilenko,*Systems of n subspaces and representations of *-algebras generated by projections,* Methods Funct. Anal. Topology 12 (2006), 57-73.
[24] V. S. Sunder, *N-subspaces,* Canad. J. Math. 40 (1988), 38-54.

(Masatoshi Enomoto) 1-6-13, Nogami, Takarazuka,Hyogo, Japan
E-mail address: enomotoma@hotmail.co.jp

(Yasuo Watatani) Department of Mathematical Sciences, Kyushu University, Hakozaki, Fukuoka, 812-8581, Japan
E-mail address: watatani@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp